PR

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,012	09/06/2000	Jeffrey Owen Phillips	CUMP.75681	7874

7590 03/20/2003

William B Kircher
Shook Hardy & Bacon
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, KS 64105-2118

EXAMINER	
KREMER, MATTHEW J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3736	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.K

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/600,012	PHILLIPS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J Kremer	3736	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10-11, 14, 16, 21, 24, 26, 31, 34, 36, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,117,836 to Millar in view of U.S. Patent 5,833,603 to Kovacs et al. Millar discloses a method and apparatus for implanting a ventricular catheter having one end residing in the ventricular region and the other end exiting the cranial region at a distal location. (Abstract of Millar). Millar discloses an opening in the skull 14 and the insertion of the catheter 26 into a region of cerebral spinal fluid 22. (Fig. 1 of Millar). The catheter 26 has openings 28 which allow intracranial fluid to pass from brain 20 to the inside of the catheter. (column 6, lines 9-18 of Millar). A transducer 40 is placed in catheter 26. (column 6, lines 19-41 of Millar). The transducer is used to measure chemical content, pressure, hemodynamics, and waveform responses. (column 4, lines 28-32 of Millar). Millar does not explicitly teach the use of a pH sensor inside the body. Millar teaches that the transducer is used to measure chemical content, pressure, hemodynamics, and waveform responses. (column 4, lines 28-32 of Millar). Kovacs et al. teaches a pH sensor (column 3, lines 34-

36 of Kovacs et al.) that is inserted into cerebrospinal fluid (column 10, lines 19-23 of Kovacs et al.) which can be placed on a flexible catheter (column 5, lines 35-38 of Kovacs et al.). Such a sensor falls within the scope of chemical content as suggested by Millar et al. since pH is a measure of hydrogen-ion concentration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the pH sensor of Kovacs et al. in the method and apparatus of Millar et al. since Millar et al. teaches that sensors that measure chemical content can be used and Kovacs et al. teaches one such sensor. In regard to claim 11, the catheter is implanted in the ventricular region. (Abstract of Millar). In regard to claims 14 and 24, the sensor includes an extension tube 14 and the sensor is locked within the catheter by the use of a seal 56. (Fig. 5 of Millar). In regard to claims 16, 26, 34, and 39, Millar teaches that the transducer is used to measure chemical content, pressure, hemodynamics, and waveform responses. (column 4, lines 28-32 of Millar). Kovacs et al. teaches a sensor for determining CO_2 and O_2 (column 10, lines 3-17 of Kovacs et al.) that is inserted into cerebrospinal fluid (column 10, lines 19-23 of Kovacs et al.) which can be placed on a flexible catheter (column 5, lines 35-38 of Kovacs et al.). Such a sensor falls within the scope of chemical content as suggested by Millar et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CO_2 and O_2 sensors of Kovacs et al. in the method and apparatus of the combination since Millar et al. teaches that sensors that measure chemical content can be used and Kovacs et al. teaches one such sensor.

3. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,117,836 to Millar in view of U.S. Patent 5,833,603 to Kovacs et al. as applied to claims 10 and 21, and further in view in view of U.S. Patent 5,830,188 to Abouleish. The combination does not teach inserting the catheter into a region of cerebral spinal fluid until expression of the fluid indicate that the catheter has reached the cerebral ventricle. It is well known in the art that expression of cerebral spinal fluid is an indication that the catheter is properly inserted in a region of cerebral spinal fluid. (column 5, lines 25-33 of Abouleish). Such a method provides the necessary information for the caregiver to carry out the insertion step as required by the combination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use expression of the cerebral spinal fluid to indicate that the catheter is properly positioned since such a method provides the necessary information for the caregiver to carry out the insertion step as required by the combination.

4. Claims 17, 19-20, 27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,117,836 to Millar in view of U.S. Patent 5,833,603 to Kovacs et al. as applied to claims 10, 16, 21 and 26, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,904,237 to Janese. The combination does not teach the monitoring of the CSF fluid within the initial 24 hours following trauma. It is known in the art that diagnosis, management, and/or treatments of cerebral spinal fluid takes place during intra-cranial arterial vasospasm, subarachnoid hemorrhage, trauma to the brain and spinal cord, and

fetal intra-cranial hemorrhage. (column 10, lines 23-35 of Janese). The purpose of the invention is to function as a diagnostic tool at such times. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the combination at times of arterial vasospasm, subarachnoid hemorrhage, trauma to the brain and spinal cord, and fetal intra-cranial hemorrhage since it is the purpose of the combination to provide diagnostic aid at these times. The combination does not disclose monitoring within the initial 24 or 48 hours of the trauma. It is known in the art that the monitoring and treatment of patients after a trauma is routinely performed to improve the patient's chances for survival. The patient's survival will particularly increase if monitoring and treatment are initiated as soon possible after the trauma. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and apparatus of the combination to include initiating monitoring and treatment within 24 hours from the head trauma since the immediate attention will improve the patient's chances for survival. In regard to claim 17 and 27, Janese teaches that the pH and other parameters are monitored to detect any dangerous or significant changes in the medical management of the patient. These changes alert the technician that something is wrong with the system or the patient which requires immediate attention. (column 8, lines 50-60 of Janese). The arrangement inherently includes comparing the reading with a base line or threshold. Therefore, it would have been obvious to compare the pH with a baseline since changes relative to the baseline can alert the technician that something is wrong with the patient which requires immediate attention.

5. Claims 10-12, 15, 21-22, 25, 31-33, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,833,603 to Kovacs et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,903,707 to Knute et al. Kovacs et al. teaches a pH sensor (column 3, lines 34-36 of Kovacs et al.) that is inserted into cerebrospinal fluid (column 10, lines 19-23 of Kovacs et al.) which can be placed on a flexible catheter (column 5, lines 35-38 of Kovacs et al.). Kovacs et al. does not teach a specific embodiment of the catheter for examination in cerebrospinal fluid. Knute et al. teaches a catheter assembly for examination in cerebrospinal fluid. Such a catheter assembly would fall within the scope of the catheter suggested by Kovacs et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the sensor of Kovacs et al. on the catheter of Knute et al. since Kovacs et al. teaches that the sensor can be mounted on a catheter and Knute et al. teaches one such catheter. In regard to claim 10, the catheter assembly is inserted through an opening in a skull to monitor a parameter of the brain. (column 1, lines 42-45 of Knute et al.). In regard to claims 10 and 21, a hole is drilled in the skull, a catheter is inserted into a CSF region, and changes of the pH are measured. (Fig. 1 of Knute et al.). In regard to claims 31-32 and 36-37, the catheter 21 includes a rigid portion 33 adapted to fit slidingly within the opening 29 in the bolt means 17 and a flexible portion 35 adapted to penetrate into a ventricle 37 of the brain. The flexible portion 35 has an opening 39 from the lumen 31 to an exterior surface 41 of the catheter 19 for communication between the lumen 31 and any fluid 43 (including cerebrospinal fluid) adjacent the

catheter 19. (column 3, lines 22-39 of Knute et al.). In regard to claims 12 and 22, the bolt means 17 and clamping means 21 are used to fix the catheter to the opening in the skull. (column 3, lines 10-21 of Knute et al.). In regard to claims 15, 25, 33, and 38, there are means for draining fluid from the brain and a pressure transducer. (column 4, lines 9-20 of Knute et al.).

6. Claims 18, 28, 35, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,833,603 to Kovacs et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,903,707 to Knute et al. as applied to claims 10, 21, 31, and 36, and further in view of U.S. Patents 5,403,746 to Bentsen et al. and Re. 31,879 to Lubbers et al. The combination does not teach collecting, storing, and comparing the pH data. The combination teaches many techniques for using organic and inorganic dyes can be used. (column 10, lines 3-17 of Kovacs et al.). It is well known in the art that techniques and the apparatuses for carrying out the techniques include processors for processing signals from chemical dye sensors which collect, store and compare readings. (column 20, lines 50-67 of Bentsen et al. which incorporates column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 8 of U.S. Patent Reissue Re. 31,879 to Lubbers et al.). These techniques of processing fall under the scope of techniques suggested by Kovacs et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the processing method and hardware of Bentsen et al. and Lubbers et al. in the combination since Kovacs et al. teaches many techniques of using organic and

inorganic dyes can be used and Bentsen et al. and Lubbers et al. teaches such techniques.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the examiner would like to address one of the argument by the Applicant from the Response received 1/27/2003. In regard to Applicant's argument that a pH sensor does not fall within the scope of a sensor that detects chemical content, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The measure pH is a measure of the hydrogen ion concentration in a solution. (Webster's New World Dictionary, p. 1011). The hydrogen ion concentration falls within the scope of the chemical content of a fluid.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Kremer whose telephone number is 703-605-0421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. through Fri. between 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Winakur can be reached on 703-308-3940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0758 for regular communications and 703-308-0758 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

Matthew Kremer
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 3736
March 14, 2003

MAX F. HINDENBURG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700